

## REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 15, 2007. With the cancellation of claims 1, 7-9, 18-19, 26, 37 and 46, and the addition of claim 47, Claims 2-6 and 10-17, 20-25, 27-36, 38-45 and 47 are presented herewith for consideration.

### Rejection of Claims 1-6, 10-20, 22-33, 35-42 and 44-46 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 10-20, 22-33, 35-42 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,163,779 to Mantha (hereinafter “Mantha”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0116444 to Chaudhri (hereinafter “Chaudhri”). Claims 1, 18-19, 26, 37 and 46 have been canceled from the application and it is requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn. Independent claims 2, 22, 35 and 44, and claims dependent thereon, have been amended in a way that is believed not to be obvious over the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other.

For example, the claims have been amended to recite a network, a client device and a server (or a reverse proxy server) associated with the network, and that the various steps are performed by the server (or reverse proxy server). This feature is nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other. For example, in Mantha, the client performs the wrapping and other operations.

In addition, the claims have been amended to recite that the server (or reverse proxy server) determines whether a link in the content is resolvable by an Internet DNS or a local DNS, and then the server (or reverse proxy server) either wraps or does not wrap the link, depending on whether it is resolvable by the Internet or local DNS. In particular, the claims as amended recite:

(d) determining, by the reverse proxy server, whether said link identified in said step (c) is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network;

(e) wrapping, by the reverse proxy server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system.

This feature is nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other. In particular, Mantha does not determine whether a link is resolvable by an Internet or local DNS. And Mantha does not determine whether to wrap a link based on whether it is resolvable by an Internet or local DNS. All links in Mantha are downloaded to a local disk drive and all links are wrapped. Chaudhri adds nothing to the teaching of Mantha in this regard.

With respect to claim 44, in addition to the above-described limitations, the claim as amended additionally recites the feature of a first client device requesting information that is sent to a second client device. This feature is also not disclosed, taught or suggested in any of the references, taken alone or in combination with each other. In Mantha, content is requested by and downloaded to a single device – internet client machine 10. The same is true in Chaudhri.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-6, 10-17, 20, 22-25, 27-33, 35-36, 38-42 and 44-45 present subject matter that is patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination with each other, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of 2-6, 10-17, 20, 22-25, 27-33, 35-36, 38-42 and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 21, 34 and 43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21, 34 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha and Chaudhri as applied to Claims 2, 22 and 35 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,065 to Rodkin (hereinafter “Rodkin”). Claims 21, 34 and 43 depend on independent claims 2, 22 and 35. As indicated above, these independent claims recite features that are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the combination of Mantha and Chaudhri. In particular, the claims as amended recite a network, a client device and a reverse proxy server, where the steps are performed by the reverse proxy server. Moreover, the claims as amended recite the steps of determining whether a link is resolvable by an Internet or local DNS, and then determining whether to wrap a link based on whether it is resolvable by an Internet or local DNS. Rodkin adds nothing to the teachings of Mantha and Chaudhri in this regard. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references, taken alone or in combination

with each other, fail to teach or suggest the invention recited in claims 21, 34 and 43. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 21, 34 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claim 47

Claim 47 has been added to the application as being dependent on claim 44, and as such, is patentable over the cited references at least for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 44. No new matter has been added.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of Claims 2-6 and 10-17, 20-25, 27-36 and 38-45, and consideration of claim 47, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to change any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this document.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 15, 2008

By: /Brian I. Marcus/  
Brian I. Marcus  
Reg. No. 34,511

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP  
575 Market Street, Suite 2500  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 369-9660  
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665